

Serial No. 10/780,400
June 16, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 30, 2005
Page 5 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 2, 5, 10 and 11 and cancel claims 1, 6 and 9.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the drawings allegedly failed to show the subject matter recited claim 6. Applicants have canceled claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mizoguchi et al. (JP 2002-325002 or JP 2002-335111). Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-280806). Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-368503). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-280806 or JP 2002-368503) or Mizoguchi et al. (JP 2002-325002 or JP 2002-335111) in view of Kanba et al. (U.S. 2002/0053960). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-280806 or JP 2002-368503) in view of Mizoguchi et al. (JP 2002-325002). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi et al. (JP 2002-325002 or JP 2002-335111). Claims 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi et al (JP 2002-325002 or JP 2002-335111) or Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-368503) in view of Kaminami et al. (JP 2002-280806).

Applicants have amended claim 10 to be in independent form including all of the features of base claim 1 and intervening claim 9. In addition, Applicants have canceled claims 1, 6 and 9, and amended claims 2, 5 and 10 to be dependent upon allowable claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art rejections of

Serial No. 10/780,400
June 16, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 30, 2005
Page 6 of 6

claim 1 are moot, and that claim 10 is allowable, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are allowable

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2005


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080